

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

EDITED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

PROFESSOR IN THE WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHICAGO

Volume IV

OCTOBER, 1920

Number 2

THE SUMERIAN PARADISE OF THE GODS

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

Now and then the tedium of Assyriological study, where tranquillity and goodfellowship normally prevail, is relieved by an opportunity to manifest that difference of opinion which is so common to other Oriental fields of research. In the year 1913 Dr. Stephen Langdon, now professor of Assyriology in Oxford University, discovered among the tablets of the Nippur Collection in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, a triangular fragment containing the upper portion of the obverse and the lower portion of the reverse of a three-column tablet, numbered 4561. The fragment contains about fifty lines. Langdon copied the contents of the tablet, and took his materials with him to England, where in the following year¹ they were first described publically by Sayce at the June meeting of the *Society of Biblical Archaeology* in London. In the summer of 1914 Langdon published a preliminary account of his find in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*,² and the public was made aware of the importance of the new inscription by an epitome which appeared in the *London Times*. Meanwhile, students at the Philadelphia Museum had discovered one large and one small fragment of the same tablet, restored the tablet, photographed it, and sent copies of the photographs to Langdon. He immediately set to work upon it, and in the November's number of the journal of the same Society published a fairly full account of the restored tablet with reproductions of the photographs of the obverse and reverse.³ He estimated that the original tablet contained about

¹ PSBA 1914, 196-198.

² PSBA 1914, 188-196.

³ PSBA 1914, 253-264.

two hundred and forty lines, and, judging by its style and contents, was written in its present form about 2000 B.C.

Thus far, only descriptions and translations of brief passages here and there in the inscription had been made public. But the indefatigable discoverer of the tablet was not idle, for in the following year he published a complete transliteration and translation of the text with some critical notes and full introductory discussions.⁴ In the same volume he published an autograph copy, made mostly from photographs of the restored tablet. Langdon declared that his tablet, which is in Sumerian, contains an epic of Paradise, the Flood and the Fall of Man, a theme which has always inspired the profoundest thoughts of mankind. The epic, as understood by Langdon, tells how Enki and his consort Ninella ruled over mankind in paradise where there were no sins and no imperfections. But for some unknown reason Enki decided to overwhelm man with his waters, in which project he was ably assisted by Nintur, an earth mother-goddess, under the title Ninharsag. The flood came on, and endured for nine months, and only one man escaped, namely Tagtug, whom Langdon identifies with Uta-napishtim and Noah. After the waters receded, Tagtug became a gardener, to whom Enki revealed certain agricultural secrets. But Nintur forbade Tagtug to eat of the cassia. In this he was disobedient, and was punished by Ninharsag with bodily weakness and loss of the longevity of antediluvian times. However, the gods sent him patrons of healing and of various arts to comfort and help him. Such, in general, is Langdon's idea of the contents of this inscription.

But no sooner had the press delivered itself than there arose rumblings of the impending storm. And when the storm finally broke, the Assyrian coming down like a wolf on the fold was nothing to the uproar that arose in the erstwhile quiet and tranquil Assyrian camp. New nibs, ink, and paper were purchased and the fray began. *I-na mah-ri-e gir-ri-šu*, Jastrow attacked the soundness of Langdon's interpretation and the accuracy of much of his translation, declaring that the first part of the text contains a series of independent myths about the beginnings of things to serve as a basis and justification

⁴ S. Langdon, *Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood and the Fall of Man* (Publications of the Babylonian Section, University of Pennsylvania, Vol. X, No. 1), Philadelphia, 1915.

for the series of incantation formulae at the end of the text. These formulae having been used as an incantation ritual to promote fertility of the fields, and to act as a remedy against disease. The fury of Jastrow's attack was in direct proportion to the time which had elapsed since Langdon first published his "Epic." But Jastrow made up for lost time, for his first article, "Sumerian Myths of Beginnings,"⁵ which was quite elaborate, was immediately followed by a second, called "Sumerian View of Beginnings," which appeared in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*,⁶ and which he caused to be published in the French periodical, *Revue Archeologique*.⁷ His third attack appeared in the same year, 1917, again in the *Journal of the same Society*,⁸ in which, under the title, "Sumerian and Akkadian Views of Beginnings," he confirmed his former deductions, and emphasized afresh his belief that the text contains a series of disconnected episodes dealing with the manner in which at the beginning of time the world was made habitable and fertile through Enki and those associated with him, and of a series of incantation formulae to promote fertility. In the same *Journal*, A. J. Carnoy, in an article entitled "Iranian Views of Origins in connection with Similar Babylonian Beliefs,"⁹ and A. L. Frothingham, in an article named, "Babylonian Origin of Hermes the Snake-god and of the Caduceus," *American Journal of Archaeology*,¹⁰ agree with Jastrow and assume his conclusions.

But before Jastrow's attack was launched in January 1917, both Sayce¹¹ and Scheil¹² had published reviews of Langdon's work, in which they partly, but mildly, agreed with him; and Lods,¹³ simply assuming Langdon's results, had discussed the material, especially in its bearing upon the Old Testament. About the same time Langdon himself published a popular account of his "Epic" with a rather full translation, in the *Expository Times*.¹⁴

Closely following Jastrow, but evidently written before Jastrow's first article had appeared, Prince wrote an article, called "The So-

⁵ AJSL 1917 (Jan.), 91-144.

⁹ JAOS 1917, 300-320.

⁶ JAOS 1917, 122-135.

¹⁰ Vol. 20, 175-211.

⁷ Vol. 4, 358-372.

¹¹ *Expository Times* 1915 (Nov.), 88-90.

⁸ JAOS 1917, 274-299.

¹² *Comptes Rendus* 1915, 526-537.

¹³ "Un poème babylonien sur l'âge d'or, le déluge et la chute," *Rev. Theol. et Philos.* 1916, 269-286.

¹⁴ Vol. 1916 (Jan.), 165-168.

called Epic of Paradise,"¹⁵ in which he gave a full transliteration and translation with comments. In this article, Prince disagreed with Langdon completely, but offered no systematic discussion of the poem, other than that it "is a purely ritual tendency-writing" in honour of Ea. Langdon found it rather easy to criticize some of Jastrow's and Prince's readings, for since his publication of the poem he had had an opportunity to consult the originals of the photographed fragments upon which he was obliged previously to depend. So in the JAOS 1917, 140-145, he replied to Jastrow and Prince, correcting many readings, and pleading for patience till his final text should appear, but maintaining his original thesis. To this article Langdon added another in the AJS 1917 (April), 245-249,¹⁶ supplying a revised text and translation of the passages in dispute, and again asserting that "the revised readings do not call into question my major theses." Jastrow made no reply, but Prince answered Langdon's criticism in a short article¹⁷ in which he accepted many of Langdon's textual emendations, but maintained his original interpretation of the text as a whole. The point which Prince emphasizes is one on which no other interpreter of the text agrees with him.¹⁸

Prince's defence was timid. But Jastrow's attack was duplicated, though not in the same detail and with the same wealth of illustration, by Fossey in *Rev. Critique* 1917, 273-276, and by Barton in the *American Journal of Theology* 1917, 571-597. Fossey attacked Langdon's philological work, and Barton followed Jastrow's interpretation, making a full translation of the text which he published in his *Archaeology and the Bible*, 283-289. In a bibliography of Assyriology published in the *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*,¹⁹ early in 1918, Maynard, without giving his reasons, expressed his belief that Langdon's interpretation would in time be fully accepted.

In a short article, entitled "The Gardener in the Epic of Paradise," in the *Expository Times*,²⁰ Langdon pleaded for peace, but

¹⁵ JAOS 1917, 90-114.

¹⁶ Called, "The necessary revisions of the Sumerian Epic of Paradise."

¹⁷ JAOS 1917, 269-273, "Further Notes on the So-called Epic of Paradise."

¹⁸ Namely that obv. col. I "refers to a territory which had been practically destroyed by drought."

¹⁹ Vol. II (1918), 41.

²⁰ Vol. 29 (Feb. 1918), 218-221.

with victory, defending what seemed to him at that time his weakest spot, namely, the rendering and interpretation of Tagtug, the Sumerian Noah. But, in spite of all, King, in his *Schweich Lectures*²¹ announced himself sceptical of Langdon's findings; and in Germany Witzel²² sought to show by a complete transliteration and translation of the text that there was neither Paradise, nor Flood, nor Fall of Man to be found in Langdon's poem. Witzel's study of the text is the most thorough, other than Langdon's, that has been made and comes nearer to a true understanding of the contents than any which has hitherto been published.

Last year (1919) Langdon again defended his reading Tagtug with much detail and learning in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1919, 37-41. In the *American Journal of Theology* 1919, 103-104, Luckenbill, in a very brief review, did not allow himself to be drawn into the controversy. But Albright in his fine article, "Some Cruces in the Langdon Epic," *JAOS* 1919, 65-90²³ declared his substantial agreement with Jastrow; as did also Waterman, who believes the poem to be a mythical account of the colonization of the lower Euphrates by the Sumerians.

In the autumn of 1919 Langdon's final text appeared, with transliteration, translation and discussions in French.²⁴ Some minor changes and additions were made, but the author maintained his thesis. The reading of the name Tagtug was, however, finally demonstrated. The book was reviewed by Mercer in the *JSOR* 1919, 86-88, by Sayce in the *Expository Times* 1920, 187-188; it was the subject of an editorial in the *New York Herald* in January 1920; and Waterman has promised a review for the *AJSL*.

With the final text in hand, it is now possible to examine the poem afresh. Of course, anyone who appreciates the stage at which Sumerian learning is today will realize that each sentence of the pioneer transliteration and translation of an unilingual text may be contested. Space will permit in this article, however, only for a discussion of the crucial sections.

²¹ *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in relation to Hebrew Tradition*, London, 1918.

²² "Die angebliche sumerische Erzählung von Paradies, Sintflut und Sündenfall — Ein Dilmun-Mythus" in his *Keilnschriflliche Studien*, Heft 1, 51-95, Leipzig, 1918.

²³ See also his article, "The Mouth of the Rivers," *AJSL* 1919, 161-195.

²⁴ *Le Poème Sumérien du Paradis, du Déluge et de la Chute de l'Homme*, Leroux, Paris, 1919.

About the interpretation of col. I, 1-12 there is almost unanimity.²⁵ It describes a holy and pure place where Enki and his consort, Ninella, are alone. The only serious question here has to do with the value of the second sign in line 5, and other similar places. Langdon renders it *dilmun*, identifying the place where Enki and Ninella are with Dilmun. Jastrow, Prince, Barton, and Albright are all against this. But Langdon seems to have the best of the argument, and the chances are that the *kur* here referred to is Dilmun, for any one who has had experience in classifying Babylonian signs will not have much difficulty in identifying the sign here with the classical sign and its variants for Dilmun.²⁶ Nor is there any reasonable doubt about the location of Dilmun, as an important province in the extreme south of Babylonia.²⁷ The fact that the place is spoken of as a mountain, *kur* (ll. 4, 5, 6) a country (ll. 7-13), *ki*, and a city (l. 33), *uru*; that the terms *ki* and *uru* are used synonymously to designate a habitable place; and that, as Sir William Willcocks has recently emphasized,²⁸ *kur* may mean both a mountain and a desert, just as does the modern word *jebel*; all leads to the conclusion that Dilmun designated not only the island of Bahrēn, but also included all the neighbouring islands, and the strip of coast land on the eastern border of the Persian Gulf. But even if the place should turn out not to be Dilmun, the interpretation of the poem would not be affected.

The next section, ll. 13-30 of col. I, Jastrow interprets as a poetic way of saying that no animals, nor people, nor pure water existed, and compares it with the well-known stereotyped introduction to creation narratives. Barton's objection to it as a description of paradise is that there is no river. But the most natural meaning is the most obvious, and that is that here we have a description of a place where only Enki and his consort are, where there are no beasts and no human beings, no sickness, no headache, and no river, for there is no need of cleansing, since all is perfectly pure and holy.

²⁵ Prince takes *ba* in l. 1, to mean "cut off," and renders *lāh-lāh-ga-ām*, l. 9, by "cleaned out," thus making this section refer to a place which has been practically destroyed by drought.

²⁶ The sign stands out most clearly in the plate in the English edition of the text as *ni* + *tuk*; see Mercer, *Sign List*, p. 156, l. 9, for this form of the *ni*.

²⁷ See Langdon, *Le Poème*, 4 ff.

²⁸ *From the Garden of Eden to the Crossing of the Jordan*, London, 1919, pp. 19-20.

It is a paradise of the gods that we have depicted in this first part of the poem.

In col. I, 30-II, 11 most critics are agreed that we have an appeal by Ninella to Enki for a canal for the beautifying of paradise with its waters; and in ll. 12-19 there is a description of how the "city" was supplied abundantly with sweet water, and how it became the home city (i.e. the home of assembly), and would remain so as long as the sun endured (ll. 17-19).²⁹

With col. II, 20-46 we meet difficulty. Langdon interprets this passage as an account of the flood. Jastrow's rendering is entirely different from Langdon's. He sees in this section a description of the sexual union between the god Enki and his consort Nintur, followed by the inundation of the fields. The passage, thus, symbolizes the beginning of life by the sexual union between Enki and Nintur. Prince's argument here is not constructive.

Let it be noted in passing that the name of Enki's daughter or consort in this passage should be read Nintur. Langdon reads Nintud and Jastrow renders Nintu, but obv. III 40, where the sign *ri* follows *tu(r)*, proves conclusively that the name is to be read Nintur. Nintur is another name for the goddess Ninella, as are also the names Damgalnunna, Ninharsag, and Ninkur (not Ninkurra), which also occur in this poem.

Jastrow's rendering of lines 20-31 is approximately correct. It is a naive and frank description of the sexual union between Enki and Nintur. Line 24 is a good example of the way in which Langdon has fallen into error. The line should be transliterated *uš 30-a-ni-e-a*³¹ *ba-an-ši-in-dun*³² *e*, just as Langdon transliterates it; but it should be translated "penem suum in vulvam infixit," instead of "His counsel in the temple revealed." In fact, Langdon's translation of the whole passage is difficult to understand as referring to anything in particular. For example, he renders lines 27-31 thus:

²⁹ Line 19 is to be rendered, "As long as the sun shines forth it shall be so," *NI-NE-šū ḫbabbar ud-dé-a ūr ḫe-na-nam-ma*.

³⁰ *Uš* denotes penis according to SAI 3424; Delitzsch, *Ursprung der Keilschriftzeichen*, pp. 92 f.; and Barton, *Babylonian Writing* I 175 and II 113.

³¹ This is a euphemism for *vulva*.

³² *Dun*, according to Br. 9879 = *ḥarānu*, dig, bore.

He spoke "Unto me man enters not"
 Enki spoke,
 By heaven he swore.
 "Cause him to sleep for me, cause him to sleep for me," was
 his word.
 Enki the father of Damgalnunna uttered his word.

But when rendered in the following manner the connection with the context is clear:

She spoke, Unto me no man will enter.
 Enki spoke,
 By heaven he swore:
 "Lie with me, lie with me," was his word.
 Enki, the father of Damgalnunna, uttered his word.

Line 32 is the most crucial in this part of the poem.

Langdon renders:

^anin-har-sag-gà-ge a-šag-ga ba-ni-in-rig
 "O Ninharsag, I will destroy the fields with a deluge."

Prince renders:

^anin-har-sag-gà-ge a-šag-ga ba-ni-in-ri
 "The fields of Ninharsag I will inundate."

Jastrow translates:

"The fields through Ninharsag were inundated";

and with this Barton agrees. But, as Witzel³³ has pointed out, *a* does not necessarily go with *šag-ga* (Br. 11587), and *šag* can be interpreted "lap" (Br. 8005), with *a* as "seed," making possible the rendering, "Ninharsag was made pregnant." Line 33 should then be rendered, *a šag-ga šu-ba-ni-in-ti a ^aen-ki-ga-ka*, "the seed in her lap she received, the seed of Enki," instead of Langdon's translation, "the fields received the waters of Enki." If then line 34 be rendered *ud-áš-ám iti-áš-a-ni*, "the first day was her first month," the following seven lines in a similar manner, and line 42 be translated, "the ninth day was her ninth month — the month of birth (complete pregnancy)," the section will obviously mean that Nintur, the mother of birth, needs not nine months but only nine days for

³³ Witzel, *op. cit.* 80-83.

the process of motherhood. Finally, by rendering lines 45 and 46 by "Ninkur gave birth," we have in ll. 20-46 an account of the birth of the first divine son in the paradise of the gods — Ninkur (i.e. Nintur, Ninella) the wife and daughter of Enki being the mother of the first divine son.

The episode in col. III 1-38 is not clearly understood by Jastrow, although he thinks there are two incantation texts, one for the purifying of the fields and the other for the purifying of an individual. In lines 1-20 Langdon sees the embarkation and the flood described. That both Langdon and Jastrow have failed to gather the import of these lines will be seen from the following rendering:

⁴nin-tur gū-īd-da-ge-šū mi-ni-ib-gi-gi
⁴en-ki-ge mā-ra im-da-lal-e-dé im-da-lal-e-dé
 sukkal-a-ni ⁴isimu-ne gū-mu-na-de-e
 galu-tur šág-ga-e-dé nu-mu-un-zu-te-bi
 5 ⁴nin-tur šág-ga-e [-dé nu-mu-un-zu-te-bi]
 sukkal-a-ni ⁴isimu-ne mu-na-ni-ib-gi-gi
 galu-tur šág-ga-e-dé nu mu-un-zu-te-bi
⁴nin-tur šág-[ga-e-dé nu-mu-un-zu-te-bi]
 lugal-mu nī-dirig-ga-ri nī-dirig-ga-ri
 10 gir-ni áš-a ⁴šāmá-a ne-in-gub
 min-gu-ma maškim-ma nam-mi-in-gub
 gab-im-ma-an-tab pil-im-ma-an-su-ub
⁴en-ki-ge a šag-ga ba-ni-in-rig
 a šag-ga šu-ba-ni-in-ti a ⁴en-ki-ga-ka
 15 ud-áš-am iti-áš-a-ni

20 ⁴nin-tu[r ama kalam-ma-ka] in-tu-ud

Nintur (was) on the bank of the river. Said to her
 Enki: "May she have intercourse with me, have inter-
 course."

His herald, Isimu,³⁴ he commanded (to say):

"A young person should comply with wishes,

5 Nintur should comply with wishes."³⁵

³⁴ ⁴PAD-SIG-NUN-ME according to Br. 1202 = ⁴i-si-mu, the messenger of
⁴Enki.

³⁵ Literally, a young person should not oppose to comply. This would see in šág an
 equivalent of *damāku*, and in *zu-te* the verb *zāru*.

His herald, Isimu, announced to her:³⁶

“A young person should comply with wishes,
Nintur should comply with wishes.

My king³⁷ is clothed with surpassing majesty.”³⁸

10 Her foot at once³⁹ she set in the bark.⁴⁰

The watchman⁴¹ presented himself to both of them.⁴²

She cast herself down,⁴³ she kissed the dust.⁴⁴

Enki impregnated her;

The seed in her lap she received, the seed of Enki.

15 The first day was her first month.

20 Nintur, the mother of the land, gave birth.⁴⁵

Thus, we have here an account of another birth, probably that of a second son to the divine pair. It seems that there was at first some reluctance on the part of Nintur to comply with Enki's wishes,⁴⁶ but an exhibition of Enki's majesty served to remind her of her duty, and a second child was born with the same despatch and ease as in the former case.

In col. III 21-38 there follows an account of the birth of the third child to the divine pair. The goddess is here called Ninkur, but the parallelism in lines 19 and 20, where both names, Ninkur and Nintur occur, shows that Ninkur is the same as Nintur, and it is also the same as Ninharsag, both being “lady of the mountain.” According

³⁶ See Br. 6330.

³⁷ In reference, of course, to Enki, and not to Tagtug (with Langdon) who is not yet born.

³⁸ Cf. Albright, *op. cit.* 75.

³⁹ Literally, at one (*āš-a*).

⁴⁰ In lines 9-12 Langdon sees a reference to the survivor of the deluge taking refuge in a boat. In the interpretation of the poem, line 10 is crucial. But according to the above rendering, it refers to Nintur who goes again to Enki in response to his command. They both cross the water to another part of the divine paradise, Dilmun, where they again copulate.

⁴¹ This probably refers to the herald.

⁴² The term *gu-ma* is probably a phonetic writing of *kam-ma*. Indeed *kam* may be the reading; see Mercer, *Sign-List*, p. 185, ll. 5-6.

⁴³ Literally, “she cast her breast down,” *gab*, “breast” (Delitzsch, *Glossar*, 76), and *tab*, “to cast down” (*Glossar*, 152).

⁴⁴ According to SAI 3158 *pil-lā* = *lu'u*, “dirtied.” The word *su-ub*; “to kiss,” is common.

⁴⁵ Same as above.

⁴⁶ Note, however, that she finally refused to bear a fourth time to Enki, rev. II 37-41.

to line 39, the third child is Tagtug. The reading of this name has been disputed. Jastrow, Barton, and others preferring Takku or Tagku. Albright suggested Šum-mu tentatively. This reading he withdrew in JAOS 40, 74. But, although Tak-tur⁴⁷ is quite possible, and also Tak-ku, contrary to Langdon's opinion that the second sign in the name cannot be *ku* (see Mercer, *Sign-List*, pp. 103 and 97), yet the array of evidence brought forth by Langdon in the French edition of the Epic in favour of the reading Tagtug is very convincing.⁴⁸

The fact that Tagtug is written with the divine determinative has given both Langdon and his critics some concern. But with our interpretation of the poem, the divine determinative is most suitable and even essential, since Tagtug is the son of Enki and Nintur. Furthermore, this interpretation would relieve Langdon of his forced equation, Tagtug = Noah.

The last section of the obverse is broken at the end, but what remains, namely, lines 39–44, with what is left of the beginning of the first column of the reverse, namely lines 18–21, introduces us to the home of Enki and Nintur, where Nintur clothed Tagtug splendidly,⁴⁹ purified him (*na-ga-e-ri*), and related to him her experience with her husband, Enki,

gù-ga-ra-ab-dúg enim-enim-mu . . .

I will tell thee; my words . . .

galu-áš-ám mà-ra im-da-lal-e-dé [im-da-lal-e-dé]

A man has had intercourse with me, has had intercourse;

en-ki-ge mà-ra im [-da-lal-e-dé im-da-lal-e-dé]

Enki has had intercourse with me, has had intercourse.⁵⁰

Exactly what is the drift of lines 18–21 is difficult to make out in view of the present broken condition of the text.⁵¹

⁴⁷ See Langdon, *Le Poème*, p. 137, n. 2; also *Expository Times* 1918, 219.

⁴⁸ See Langdon, *Le Poème*, *passim*.

⁴⁹ The term *sal-ni-dim*, l. 39, is made up of *sal*, "splendour" (cf. *sal-dúg* = *kunnū*, "to make beautiful") and *dim* "to make," and means "to make splendid" or "to decorate."

⁵⁰ Cf. col. III 2. The "man" is Enki.

⁵¹ But in view of the contents of rev. II 7–47, it is likely that lines 20–21 should be translated with Witzel, thus:

"In the house let him fall into my trap;
Enki—let him fall into my trap."

The passage in rev. I 22-48 is interesting. Tagtug is introduced to his father Enki who receives him, honours him, and gives him the status of Enlil (cf. rev. II 40-43). Langdon interprets this section as a description of Tagtug's introduction to the Babylonian paradise and of the way in which the garden was made fertile. In reality it is a description of the way in which Nintur introduced her son into the paradise of the gods; how he met his father, Enki, who enquired who he was; and how Enki honoured him by crowning him:

44 *^den-ki-ge ^dtag-tūg-ra sal-ni-dim*

Enki conferred honour upon Tagtug.

48 *^dtag-tūg sal-ni-dim hub⁵² mu-na-ab-zi šu-mu-ni-sig-gi⁵³*

He conferred honour upon Tagtug; he placed a tiara on him, and bound it upon him.

The beginning of rev. II is badly broken. But commencing with line 8, Langdon interprets this column, ll. 8-47, as an account of the Fall of Man. Eight plants grew in the garden, seven of which were permitted for food. The eighth, the cassia, was forbidden. Tagtug, however, ate the cassia, and was immediately cursed by Ninharsag in the name of Enki. This act the Anunnaki bewailed, and the column ends with an angry altercation between Ninharsag and Enlil. Just as in the case of the supposed flood, so here we shall have occasion to see that the text has nothing to say of a Fall of Man. It is, in reality, another episode in the garden of the gods.

In the garden of the gods there grew eight plants (ll. 7-14). These Enki used to induce Ninharsag (Nintur) again (*mà-ra im-da-lal-e-dé im-da-lal-e-dé*, "may she have intercourse with me, have intercourse," l. 15). He sent his herald, Isimu, to Ninharsag assuring her that she may depend upon the plants, for their destiny is fixed, and they are healthful:

[^den-ki-gje ū nam-bi ne-in-tar šag-ba ba-ni-in-sig⁵⁴

Enki determined the destiny of the plants: by them is man made whole. But Ninharsag swore by the name of Enki that he (Enki) would not see her face again:

⁵² Br. 2690, *lu kub-bu* = *kuppū* = "a turban-maker."

⁵³ Br. 7180, *šu-sig-gi* = *rākisu* = "to bind."

⁵⁴ Delitzsch, *Glossar*, 238.

37 ^d*nin-har-sag-gà-ge mu* ^d*en-ki nam-erim ba-an-kud*

Ninharsag swore by the name of Enki, (saying):

38 *i-dé na-ăm-til-la en-na ba-úg-gi-a i-dé ba-ra-an-ba-ri-en*

"The face of life, until he dies, shall he not look upon."

And so furious was the great goddess that the Anunnaki cowered in the dust before her.

Line 38 is one of the most crucial passages in the poem, from the point of view of Langdon's interpretation. It contains the supposed curse on mankind. The discussions by Jastrow, Prince, Barton, Sayce, Waterman, and Albright as to the meaning of this passage are all beside the mark. "The face of life" refers to Ninharsag herself. It is equivalent to saying, My face, as long as I live, shall he not see again. Witzel suggests that "life" may refer to Ninharsag herself as the "Mother of Life" — "the face of the Mother of Life (Ninharsag), until he dies, shall he not look upon."

Then Ninharsag turned to Tagtug, that is Enlil (cf. rev. 24 III 40-43), and pointed out to Enki that she had already borne children, for example, Tagtug,⁵⁵ but without any adequate reward (l. 41), and why should she be made to bear again? At this Enlil-Tagtug addressed the furious goddess, offering himself in her defence:

42 ^d*en-lil tud-lul* ^{56-a} *mu-na-ni-ib-gi-gi*
za-e ^d*nin-har-sag-gà mu-e-du-mu-un-nam*
uru-mà-a ⁵⁷*mal* ⁵⁷*ga-ri-dù mu-zu he-pad-di*

45 *alim-a* ⁵⁸*sag-ni áš-ám im-ma-an-peš-peš* ⁵⁹
[Sag]-ni áš-ám im-ma-an-búr-búr
igi-ni áš-ám pil-ne-in-gar
 Enlil answered (his) angry mother;

"Thou, Ninharsag, hast borne me.

'In my city I make weapons for thee' shall thy name be called.

The head of the ram shall one split open.

⁵⁵ Line 41 should be rendered: "I, Ninharsag, have borne thee to him; where is my reward?"

⁵⁶ Perhaps here, *búš* = angry, see Delitzsch, *Glossar*, 218.

⁵⁷ SAI 3739, ⁵⁷*mal* = *kakku*, "weapon."

⁵⁸ This refers to Enki, the ram being a symbol of Ea (Enki). Compare also Br. 8883 ff. where *alim* means "prince."

⁵⁹ Delitzsch, *Glossar*, 74-75.

His heart shall one bore through.
His eyes shall one cast in the mire."⁶⁰

Enlil-Tagtug plans to kill Enki, and with that in view makes weapons with which to accomplish his purpose. The text at this point is so broken that it is impossible to learn whether the attack was made, and if so, with what result. But rev. III 18-41 tells how Ninharsag (Nintur) became Enlil's wife (sister) and bears eight children, who are divine physicians, or protective deities.

About lines 24-41 there seems to be no serious difference of opinion among interpreters. But lines 18-23 seem to indicate that Enlil-Tagtug and Ninharsag-Nintur came to a marital understanding, and to the union were born eight divine children. These lines are to be rendered thus:

⁴*nin-har-sag-gà-ge é-[ni] kàš*⁶¹ *im-ma-an-[gin]*
⁴*en-lil* [⁴*nin-t*] *ur šú*⁶² *ga-ni ba-an-ku-bi-eš*
*li*⁶³ *im-ra-an-ag-eš*
nam im-ma-an-tar-eš
šú-li im-ra-an-búr-ru-úš
⁴*nin-har-sag-gà-ge n[am]-s [al]-la-na ba-ni-in-dúr*
 Ninharsag went hastily to his house.
 Enlil and Nintur decided her (Nintur's) destiny.
 They determined the future for themselves.
 They determined their fate.
 They determined their lot.
 Ninharsag sat down in majesty.

In the names of the eight gods who are enumerated in lines 24-41 there is a remarkable play on words in the names of the deities of healing and the character of the diseases which they are to control.

The first line of the final section of the poem, rev. III 42-51, seems to tell how Enlil-Tagtug and Ninharsag-Nintur determined the destinies of their eight children:

⁶⁰ What the other weapon will do cannot be determined because of the break at the beginning of rev. III.

⁶¹ Delitzsch, *Glossar*, p. 116.

⁶² Stands for *šug*, "support," "maintenance."

⁶³ Br. 1124, *li* = future.

tur-tur-lá-lá-ba tud-ne-en-na-áš gar-ra-en [-na-áš]

These children, as they were born, they determined (their destiny).

Then there follows a list of the names of the eight divine children, the last being, very appropriately, Enšagme, lord of Dilmun, the site of the Sumerian paradise of the gods.

In the following tabular form the contents of this ancient poem may more readily be grasped:

Obv. I 1-13 The scene opens with Enki and Ninella, alone, in Dilmun, the home or paradise of the gods.

I 13-30 Description of the purity and holiness of Dilmun.

I 31-II 11 Ninella appeals for a canal, to beautify Dilmun still further.

II 12-19 Ninella's request is granted, and Dilmun becomes the great home-city.

II 20-46 Description of the birth of the first divine son.

III 1-20 Description of the birth of the second divine son.

III 21-38 Description of the birth of Tagtug, the third divine son.

III 39- Rev. I 21 Tagtug in the home of his divine parents.

I 22-48 Tagtug is promoted to Enlilship.

Here follows a bad break in the tablet.

II 7-III 5 Enki fails to induce Nintur (Ninella) to bear a fourth child. A quarrel results, in which Tagtug comes to the rescue of his mother, and plans to kill Enki.

III 6-17 Text badly broken.

III 18-41 Tagtug (Enlil) and Nintur (Ninella-Ninharsag) marry, the result being eight divine children.

III 42-51 The last of the eight children is Enšagme, lord of Dilmun, the paradise of the gods.

In short, the poem which has been the subject of this study has nothing to say about the Flood or the Fall of man. In its original form it was a *tendenz* writing, composed to glorify Dilmun and its royal line. It describes Dilmun as the paradise of the gods, where Enki and Nintur had their home; it depicts the purity and perfec-

tion of the place; and tells how it was fertilized; it recounts the growth of the divine family, and how faithful the third child, Tagtug, was to his mother. Then trouble came, when Nintur refused to be induced by medicinal plants to bear a fourth child to Enki. What happened to Enki cannot be made out, because of the broken state of the tablet, but Tagtug becomes the consort of Nintur, and they establish themselves as husband and wife. The result of this union is the birth of eight deities, patrons of civilization, each of whom has power over a certain disease, and has assigned to him a certain sphere in the economy of things. The last of the eight children of Tagtug and Nintur is Enšagme the lord of Dilmun. Dilmun is forever glorified in that she was the paradise of the gods, and her first king was the son of the culture-god Tagtug and the mother-goddess Nintur, and grandson of the mighty Enki.

A later hand slightly transformed the last part of the poem, introducing Enlil to take Tagtug's place and so to displace Enki; and substituting Ninharsag for Nintur, thus transferring the honours belonging to the cult of Enki from the south to Nippur, the seat of Enlil. But the transformation was not thoroughly done, and it is not difficult to follow the course of the myth in its original form. The ancient poet of Dilmun did his work well. He has given us one of the best examples of the way in which the ancient world loved to assert its divine origin, and to proclaim its patriotism by seeing in the founder of its royal line a divine offspring, and in its city home the paradise of the gods.

COMPLETE TRANSLATION

OBVERSE I

1. [e-ne-ba]-ám e-ne-ba-ám me-en-ši-en

There ye are, there ye are.

2. [Kur]¹ dilmun ki² azag-ga-ám

In the land of Dilmun, which is a holy place.

3. [ki-azag]-ga e-ne-ba-ám me-en-ši-en

Holy is the place where ye are.

¹ The word *kur* like the modern word *jebel* may refer either to a hill or to a plain.

² It is better to connect *ki* with *azag-ga-ám*, since in line 5 *dilmun* occurs without the *ki*, although in line 7 it has a *ki*.

4. . . . kur dilmun ki-azag-ga-ám
 . . . the land of Dilmun is a holy place,
 5. kur dilmun ki-azag-ga-ám kur dilmun el-ám
 The land of Dilmun is a holy place; the land of Dilmun
 is pure.
 6. kur dilmun el-ám kur dilmun làh-lah-ga-ám
 The land of Dilmun is pure; the land of Dilmun is clean.
 7. áš-ni-ne dilmun-ki-a ù-ne-in-nad³
 Alone in Dilmun repose ye.
 8. ki ^{den}-ki dam-a-ni-da ba-an-da-nâ ⁴-a-ba
 The place where Enki lay down with his wife —
 9. ki-bi el-ám ki-bi làh-lah-ga-ám
 that place is pure, that place is clean.
 10. áš-ni-ne
 Alone (in Dilmun repose ye).
 11. ki ^{den}-ki ⁿⁱⁿ-el-la ba-an [-da-nâ-a-ba]
 The place where Enki lay down with Ninella —
 12. ki-bi el-ám
 that place is pure.
 13. dilmun-ki-a⁵ ú-nág-ga-hu dûg-dûg nu-mu-ni-bi
 In Dilmun the raven uttered not a cry.
 14. dar-hu-e gû-dar-hu-ri nu-mu-ni-ib-bi
 The black bird⁶ uttered not a black bird cry.
 15. ur-gu-la sag-giš nu-ub-ra-ra
 The lion kills not.
 16. ur-bar-ra-ge sîl nu-ub-kar-ri
 The jackal robs not the lambs.
 17. ur-ku máš-gam-gam nu-ub-zu
 The dog knows not the crouching kids.
 18. dun še-kú-kú-e nu-ub-zu
 The zébu (?) knows not how to eat the grain.
 19. nu-mu-un-zu dim-úr-ra . . .
 knows not . . .

³ The verb is *nad* with the imperative *ù*.

⁴ The word *nad* may here be a euphemism for cohabit.

⁵ The sign for *a* is omitted in plate I in Langdon's French edition.

⁶ For *dar*, dark, see Delitzsch *Glossar* 132. Langdon renders it kite, *Le poème*, 161, n. 4.

20. mušen-e an-na dim-bi nu-[mu-un-zu]-e
The birds of heaven know not their young.

21. tu^{bu}-e sag-nu-mu-un-da-šub-e
The doves do not roost there.

22. igi-gig-e igi-gig me-en nu-mu-ni-bi
Eye ache said not, "I am eye ache."

23. sag-gig-gi sag-gig me-en nu
Headache said not, "I am headache."

24. um-ma-bi um-ma me-en nu
A mother said not, "I am a mother."

25. ab-ba-bi ab-ba me-en nu
A father said not, "I am a father."

26. ki-el a-nu-tú-a-ni uru-a nu-mu-ni-ib-síg-gi
A girl in the city where no water is poured out was not given (in marriage).

27. galu íd-da bal-e-mi-dé nu-mu-ni-bi
A man did not say, "cross the canal."

28. ligir ⁷-e zag-ga-na nu-um-nigin
A prince did not turn away his face.⁸

29. lul-e e-lu-lam ⁹ nu-mu-ni-bi
A ruler did not say, "oppress."

30. galam uru-ka i-lu nu-mu
The ruler of the city did not say, "alas! "

31. ⁴nin-el-la a-a-ni ⁵en-ki-ra gù-mu-na-de-e
Ninella said to her father, Enki:

32. uru mu-e-síg uru mu-e-síg nam mu-sum-ma-zu
"A city hast thou founded, a city hast thou founded, and a destiny hast thou set (for it);

33. dilmun uru mu-e-síg uru
Dilmun, a city, hast thou founded, a city (hast thou founded, and a destiny hast thou set for it);

34. [uru] mu-e-síg uru
a city hast thou founded, a city (hast thou founded, and a destiny hast thou set for it);

35. íd-da nu-un-tuk-a
which does not possess a canal;

⁷ For *libir*.

⁸ I.e., was not angry.

⁹ This is for *e-lul-am*. The *e* is the sign of the imperative, and *lul* means to oppress.

36. [uru] mu-e-síg uru
 a city hast thou founded, a city (hast thou founded, and
 a destiny hast thou set for it).

37. *About 9 lines broken away.*

OBVERSE II

1. ḡir¹⁰-ma-an-gal-la-za a he-im-ta-è-dé
 May thy might, which is great, cause water to come forth!

2. uru-zu a he-gál-la hu-mu-ra-nag-nag
 May thy city drink water in abundance!

3. dilmun^{ki} a he
 May Dilmun drink water in abundance!

4. dul a-šeš-a-zu dul a-dug-ga he-im
 May thy well of bitter water become a well of sweet
 water!

5. uru-zu é-gú-kar-ra kalam-ma-ka he-a
 May thy city be the home city (house of assembly) of
 the land!

6. dilmun^{ki} é
 May Dilmun be the home city (house of assembly) of
 the land!

7. ì-ne-šù ^dutu ud-dé-a
 "Now, O sun, shine forth!"

8. ^dutu an-na gub-bi-e
 O sun, take thy place in heaven!"

9. ḡir-du a-dù-EZEN-ki-na-ta¹¹
 "From the place where the waters flow forth from their
 source,

10. é-suhur-si ^dnanna-a-ta
 From the full store-house of the moon-god,

11. ka-a-ki-a-láh-ta a-dug-ki-ta mu-na-ra-gin
 From the flowing springs of the earth, from the place of
 sweet water it shall come forth for thee."

12. ḡir-ma-an-gal-la-na a im-ta-è-dé
 May thy might, which is great, cause water to come forth!

¹⁰ See Delitzsch *Glossar* 92.

¹¹ See Albright, *op. cit.* pp. 68-70 for this difficult line.

13. uru-ni a he-gál-la im-ta-nag-nag
His city drank water in abundance.

14. dilmun^{k1} a he
Dilmun drank water in abundance.

15. dul a-šeš-a-ni a-dúg-ga na-nam
His well of bitter water became a well of sweet water.

16. a-šag a-kàr-ra nam-a-ni še mu-na-a [b-de]
The fields and prairies gave forth grain in his district.

17. uru-ni é-gú-kar-ra kalam-ma-ka na-nam
His city became the home city (house of assembly) of the land.

18. dilmun^{k1} é-gú
Dilmun became the home city (house of assembly) of the land.

19. i-ne-šù ^dutu ud-dé-a ûr he-na-nam-ma
“Now, O sun, shine forth!” Verily it was so.

20. dili ¹²-zal gišpitug-gi tuk-a
He, abounding in manhood, the sage,

21. ^dnin-tur ama-kalama-šú
To Nintur, the mother of the land;

22. ^den-ki-ge gišpitug-gi tuk-a
Enki the sage,

23. ^dnin-tur
to Nintur

24. uš ¹³-a-ni e-a ¹⁴ ba-an-ši-in-dun ¹⁵-e
penem suum in vulvam infixit

25. uš ¹⁶-a-ni maš ¹⁷-a im-im-e ba-an-ši-im-im-e
Penem suum in vulvam profundam infixit.

26. uš-a-ni bar-šú ¹⁸ mah-hi šá-ba-ra-an-zi-zi ¹⁹
His phallus, large, he would not draw aside.

¹² See Br. 27.

¹³ For uš compare M3424; also Barton, *Origin and Development of Babylonian Writing*, I 175, II 113.

¹⁴ For the interpretation of this phrase, see Witzel *op. cit.*, pp. 79, 80-81.

¹⁵ Br. 9879.

¹⁶ This is probably the same as the first sign in the previous line.

¹⁷ See Mercer *Sign List*, p. 44; M1175; Jastrow, *op. cit.* 112, n. 8.

¹⁸ See Delitzsch, *Glossar*, p. 65.

¹⁹ See Jastrow, *op. cit.*, p. 112, n. 10.

27. gù-ne-in-de mà-ra galu nu-mu-un-dib-bi
She said: "Unto me no man will come."

28. ^den-ki-ge gù-ne-in-de
Enki said:

29. zi-an-na ni-pad
"By heaven I swear:

30. ná-a mà-ra ná-a mà-ra enim-ni
Lie with me, lie with me," was his word —

31. ^den-ki-ge a ^ddam-gal-nun-na enim-ni mi-ni-in-dúg
Enki, the father of Damgalnunna, uttered his word.

32. ^dnin-har-sag-gà-ge a šag-ga ba-ni-in-rig ²⁰
Ninharsag was made pregnant.

33. a šag-ga šu-ba-ni-in-ti a ^den-ki-ga-ka
The seed in her lap she received, the seed of Enki.

34. ud-áš-ám iti-áš-a-ni
The first day was her first month.

35. ud-min-ám iti-min-a-ni
The second day was her second month.

36. ud-èš-ám iti-èš-a-ni
The third day was her third month.

37. ud-lim-ám iti-lim-a-ni
The fourth day was her fourth month.

38. ud-ià-ám iti-ià-a-ni
The fifth day was her fifth month.

39. ud-àš-ám iti-áš-a-ni
The sixth day was her sixth month.

40. ud-imin-ám iti-imin-a-ni
The seventh day was her seventh month.

41. ud-ussu-ám iti-ussu-a-ni
The eighth day was her eighth month.

42. ud elim-ám iti-elim-a-ni iti nam-sal-a-ka
The ninth day was her ninth month — the month of birth.

43. iá-LI-dím iá-Li-dím iá-dúg-nun-na-dím ²¹
Like cypress-oil, like cypress-oil, like fine butter,

44. [^dnin-tur] ama-kalama-ka
[Nintur], mother of the land,

²⁰ See Witzel, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-82.

²¹ See Witzel, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

45. [^anin-kur-ra]
Ninkur,
46. in-tu-ud
gave birth.

OBVERSE III

1. ^anin-tur gú-íd-da-ge-šú mi-ni-ib-gí-gí
Nintur (was) on the bank of the river. Said to her

2. ^aen-ki-ge mà-ra im-da-lal-e-dé im-da-lal-e-dé
Enki: "May she have intercourse with me, have intercourse."

3. sukkal-a-ni ^aisimu-ne gù-mu-na-de-e
His herald, Isimu, he commanded (to say):

4. galu-tur šág-ga-e-dé nu-mu-un-zu-te-bi
"A young person should comply with wishes."

5. ^anin-tur šág-ga-e
"Nintur should comply with wishes."

6. sukkal-a-ni ^aisimu-ne mu-na-ni-ib-gí-gí
His herald, Isimu, announced to her:

7. galu-tur šág-ga-e-dé nu-mu-un-zu-te-bi
"A young person should comply with wishes,

8. ^anin-tur šág
Nintur should comply with wishes.

9. lugal-mu ní-dirig-ga-ri ní-dirig-ga-ri
My king is clothed with surpassing majesty."

10. gír-ni áš-a ^{gíš}má-a ne-in-gub
Her foot she at once set in the bark.

11. min-gu-ma maškim-ma nam-mi-in-gub
The watchman presented himself to both of them.

12. gab-im-ma-an-tab pil-im-ma-an-su-ub
She cast herself down, she kissed the dust.

13. ^aen-ki-ge a šag-ga ba-ni-in-rig
Enki impregnated her.

14. a šag-ga šu-ba-ni-in-ti a ^aen-ki-ga-ka
The seed in her lap she received, the seed of Enki.

15. ud-áš-ám iti-áš-a-ni
The first day was her first month.

16. ud-min-ám iti-min-a-ni
The second day was her second month.

17. *ud-elim-ám iti-elim-a-ni iti-nam-sal-a-ka*
 The ninth day was her ninth month — the month of birth.

18. *iá-LI-[dím iá-LI-] dím iá-dúg-nun-na-dím*
 Like cypress-oil, like cypress-oil, like fine butter,

19. *⁹[nin-kur-ra iá-] LI*
 Ninkur, like cypress-oil,

20. *⁹nin-tu [r ama kalam-ma-ka] in-tu-ud*
 Nintur, the mother of the land, gave birth.

21. *⁹nin-kur-ra [gú-íd-da-ge-šú] mi-ni-ib-[gí-gí]*
 Ninkur (was) on the bank of the river. Said to her

22. *⁹en-ki-ge mà-ra im-[da-lal-e-dé im-da-lal-e-dé]*
 Enki: "May she have intercourse with me, have intercourse."

23. *sukkal-a-ni ⁹isimu-ne [gù-mu-na-de-e]*
 His herald, Isimu, he commanded (to say):

24. *galu-tur šág-ga-e-dé nu-mu-un-[zu-te-bi]*
 "A young person should comply with wishes."

25. *⁹nin-kur-ra šág*
 Ninkur should comply with wishes."

26. *sukkal-a-ni ⁹isimu-ne mu-na-ni-ib-gí-gí*
 His herald, Isimu, announced to her:

27. *galu-tur šág-ga-e-dé su-in-nin-ni*
 "A young person complies with wishes,

28. *⁹nin-kur-ra šág*
 Ninkur complies with wishes.

29. *lugal-mu ní-dirig-ga-ri ní-dirig-ga-ri*
 My king is clothed with surpassing majesty."

30. *gír-ni áš-a gíšmá-a ne-in-gub*
 Her foot at once she set in the bark.

31. *min-gu-ma maškim-ma nam-mi-in-gub*
 The watchman presented himself to both of them.

32. *gab-im-ma-an-tab pil-im-ma-ni-su-ub*
 She cast herself down, she kissed the dust.

33. *⁹en-ki-ge a šág ba-ni-in-rig*
 Enki impregnated her.

34. *a šag-ga šu-ba-ni-in-ti a ⁹en-ki-ga-ka*
 The seed in her lap she received, the seed of Enki.

35. **ud-áš-ám-iti-áš-a-ni**
The first day was her first month.

36. **ud-elim-ám iti-elim-a-ni iti-nam-sal-a-ka**
The ninth day was her ninth month — the month of birth

37. **iá-LI-dím iá-LI-dím ia-dúg-nun-[na-dím]**
Like cypress-oil, like cypress-oil, like fine butter,

38. **⁴nin-kur-ra iá-LI**
Ninkur, like cypress-oil, (etc.).

39. **⁴tag-túg sal-ni-dim in . . .**
She adorned Tagtug with garments ²² . . .

40. **⁴nin-tur-ri ⁴tag-túg . . . gù-mu-na-de-[e]**
Nintur said to Tagtug . . . :

41. **na-ga-e-rig na-rig mu . . .**
“I make thee splendid; splendour . . .

42. **gù-ga-ra-ab-dúg enim-enim-mu . . .**
I will tell thee; my words . . .

43. **galu-áš-ám mà-ra im-da-lal-e-dé [im-da-lal-e-dé]**
A man has had intercourse with me, has had intercourse;

44. **⁴en-ki-ge mà-ra im-[da-lal-e-dé im-da-lal-e-dé]**
Enki has had intercourse with me, has had intercourse.

45. **igi-im-?-e . . .**²³

REVERSE I

About twelve lines are missing here

13. sal-ni-dim igi-im
adorned

14. da-an-

15. a-na

16. šag giš-šar-a
in the garden

17. du

18. [é-bar-a-gu-ul-dú-] ba gin-ab ²⁴
To “the house of the splendidly adorned sanctuar

19. é-rab-ga-ra-an-ba gin-ab
To “the house of the great throne” go.

²² See Witzel, *op. cit.* pp. 84 f.

²⁴ This is the imperative form.

²³ Another line followed, but it is broken off.

20. é-a ^{túg}sú-nun-túg-tur-mu he-dúr
 In the house let him fall into my trap;

21. ^den-ki-ge ^{túg}sú-nun-túg-tur-mu he-ni-in-dúr
 Enki — let him fall into my trap.

22. min gu-ma a-si-si da-ni
 The two together collected water near it;²⁵

23. e a-ne-in-si
 The moats they filled with water;

24. pà a-ne-in-si
 The canals they filled with water;

25. kislah a-ne-in-ra
 The desert they inundated with water.

26. nu-giš-šar a-na
 The gardener

27. gú-ni gú-da im-ši-in
 Their clothes

28. a-ba me-en giš-šar
 “Who art thou, who in the garden ?”

29. ^den-ki-ge nu-giš-šar-ra
 Enki, the gardener²⁶

34. im-ma

35. é-bar-a-gu-ul-dú-ba im-ma-na-an-gin
 To “the house of the splendidly adorned sanctuary” he
 went,

36. é-rab-ga-ra-an-ba im-ma-na-an-gin ùr-ra-ni ne-in-gà-e
 To “the house of the great throne” he went; he lay
 down.²⁷

37. ^den-ki-ge igi-ni im-ma-an-sig-sig pa šu-ne-in-dù
 Enki beheld him; he held a sceptre in his hand.

38. ^den-ki-ge ^dtag-túg-ra gír-im-ma-an-gin
 Enki went up to Tagtug;

39. é-na al-de-de-e ig-kid ig-kid
 He cried in his temple: “Open the door, open the door.

40. a-ba me-en za-e me-en²⁸
 “Who art thou?”

²⁵ Lit. “in its neighbourhood,” near the house of Enki.

²⁶ Four lines are here broken away.

²⁷ Lit. “he cast himself upon his stomach.”

²⁸ Tagtug asks this question.

41. mà-e nu-giš-šar ukuš ²⁹-si giš-ma
"I am a gardener, cucumbers (and) *ma*-dates

42. šam ³⁰-šú ga-mu-ra-ab-síg
For a price I will give thee."

43. ⁴tag-túg šag-hul-la-ni-ta é-e ig-ba-an-kid
Tagtug with a glad heart opened the door of the temple.

44. ⁴en-ki-ge ⁴tag-túg-ra sal-ni-dim
Enki conferred honour upon Tagtug.

45. hul-áš gar-ra-na ba-na-ab-sum-mu
Joyously he gave him his counsel.

46. é-bar-a-gu-ul-dú-ba ba-na-ab-sum-mu
To "the house of the splendidly adorned sanctuary" he brought him.

47. é-rab-ga-ra-an-ba ba-na-ab-sum-mu
To "the house of the great throne" he brought him.

48. ⁴tag-túg sal-ni-dim hub mu-na-ab-zi šú-mu-na-síg-gi
He conferred honour upon Tagtug; he placed a tiara on him, and bound it upon him.

REVERSE II

About six lines are missing here

²⁹ See Witzel, *op. cit.* p. 88.

³⁰ See Jastrow, *AJSL* 33, 131 and 95.

15. ^den-ki-ge mà-ra im-da-lal-e-dé im-da-lal-e-dé
 Enki: May she have intercourse with me, have intercourse.

16. sukkal-a-ni ^disimu-ne gù-mu-na-de-e
 His herald, Isimu, he commanded (to say):

17. ú mà-e nam-bi li-[ne-kud-da]
 "The destiny of the plants have I determined,"

18. a-na-ám ne-e a-na-ám ne-e
 "What is this, what is this?" ³¹

19. sukkal-a-ni ^disimu-ne mu-na-ni-ib-gí-gí
 His herald, Isimu, announced to her:

20. [ugal-] mu ú-giš mu-na-ab-bi
 "My king approached the *giš*-plant,

21. mu-na-kud-dé ba-kùr-e
 He cut therefrom, he ate;

22. lugal-mu ú-gurun mu-na-ab-bi
 My king approached the *gurun*-plant

23. mu-na-sir-ri ba-kùr-e
 He plucked therefrom, he ate;

24. lugal-mu mu
 My king approached

25. mu-na-kud-dé ba
 He cut therefrom, he ate;

26. lugal-mu ú-a-gùg mu
 My king approached the *a-gùg*-plant

27. mu-na-sir-ri ba
 He plucked therefrom, he ate;

28. [ugal-mu ú-] tu-tu mu
 My king approached the *tu-tu* plant

29. mu-na-kud-dé ba
 He cut therefrom, he ate;

30. [ugal-mu ú-] mu
 My king approached the -plant,

31. [mu-na-sir-ri ba]
 He plucked therefrom, he ate;

³¹ This question is asked by Ningharsag. Beginning with line 20 comes the answer.

32. [lugal-mu ú-] [mu]
 My king approached the -plant,

33. [mu-na-kud-dé] ba
 He cut therefrom, he ate;

34. [ugal-mu ú-] am-ha-ru mu-na-ab-bi
 My king approached the cassia-plant,

35. [mu-na-sir-] ri ba-kùr-e
 He plucked therefrom, he ate.

36. [den-ki-gé] ú nam-bi ne-in-tar šag-ba ba-ni-in-sig
 Enki determined the destiny of the plants: by them is
 man made whole."

37. ^dnin-har-sag-gà ge mu ^den-ki nam-erim ba-an-kud
 Ninharsag swore by the name of Enki, (saying):

38. i-dé na-ám-til-la en-na ba-úg-gi-a i-dé ba-ra-an-bar-ri-en
 "The face of life, until he dies, shall he not look upon."

39. ^da-nun-na-ge-ne sahar-ta im-mi-in-dur-dur-ru-ne-eš
 The Anunnaki sat down in the dust.

40. lul-a ^den-lil-ra mu-na-ra-ab-bi
 Distressed she spoke unto Enlil:

41. mà-e ^dnin-har-sag-gà mu-e-ši-du-mu-un a-na-ám nig-ba-mu
 "I, Ninharsag, have borne ³² thee to him; where is my
 reward?"

42. ^den-lil tud-lul-a mu-na-ni-ib-gí-gí
 Enlil answered (his) angry mother:

43. za-e ^dnin-har-sag-gà mu-e-du-mu-un-nam
 "Thou, Ninharsag, hast borne me.

44. uru-mà-a ³³ gí³⁴ mal ga-ri-du mu-zu he-pad-di
 'In my city I make weapons for thee' shall thy name be
 called.

45. alim-a sag-ni áš-ám im-ma-an-pèš-pèš
 The head of the ram shall one split open.

46. [šag]-³⁴ ni áš-ám im-ma-an-búr-búr
 His heart shall one bore through.

47. igi-ni áš-ám pil-ne-in-gar
 His eyes shall one cast in the mire."

³² This has reference to Tagtug (Enlil).

³³ If this sign is not *a*, it might be the sign for *2*, and the line would read "'In my
 city I make two weapons for thee' shall thy name be called."

³⁴ This may be *ka*, mouth.

REVERSE III

About five lines are missing here

6. -ne-en ^den-lil Enlil . . .

7. -ne-en ^dNannar Nannar . . .

8. . . . šú mu-gín-ne-en ^d they went

9. šú mu-gín-ne-en ^d they went

10. ? ub ni-me-a zi-mu-mu mu

11. ba

12. ^dnin-har-sag-gà-ge Ninharsag

13-16

17. ba-an

18. ^dnin-har-sag-gà-ge é-[ni] kàš im-ma-an-[gin]
Ninharsag went hastily to his house

19. ^den-lil [^dnin-t] ur šú-ga-ni ba-an-ku-bi-eš
Enlil and Nintur decided her (Nintur's) destiny.

20. li im-ra-an-ag-eš
They determined the future for themselves.

21. nam im-ma-an-tar-eš
They determined their fate.

22. šú-li im-ra-an-bur-ru-uš
They determined their lot.

23. ^dnin-har-sag-gà-ge n[am]-s [al]-la-na ba-ni-in-dúr
Ninharsag sat down in majesty.

24. šeš-mu a-na-zu a-ra-gig
My brother, what of thee is ill?

25. ab ³⁵-tur ³⁶-mu ma-gig
My cow of the fold is ill.

26. ^dab-ú im-ma-ra-an-tu-ud
Abu I bear for thee.

27. šeš-mu a-na-zu a-ra-gig
My brother, what of thee is ill?

³⁵ See Br. 8865.

³⁶ See Br. 2664.

28. ú-tul ²⁷-mu ma-gig
My flock is ill.

29. ^dnin-tul-la im-ma-ra-an-tu-ud
Nintulla I bear for thee.

30. šeš-mu a-na-zu a-ra-gig ka-mu ma-gig
My brother, what of thee is ill? My mouth is ill.

31. ^dnin-ka-ù-tud im-ma-ra-an-tu-ud
Ninkautud I bear for thee.

32. šeš-mu a-na-zu a-ra-gig ka-mu ma-gig
My brother, what of thee is ill? My mouth is ill.

33. ^dnin-ka-si im-ma-ra-an-tu-ud
Ninkasi I bear for thee.

34. šeš-mu a-na-zu a-ra-gig n[a-zi ²⁸ ma-gig]
My brother, what of thee is ill? My genitals are ill.

35. ^dna-zi im-ma-ra [-an-tu-ud]
Nazi I bear for thee.

36. šeš-mu a-na-zu a-ra-gig da[-zi ma-gig]
My brother, what of thee is ill? My side is ill.

37. ^dda-zi-mă-a im-ma-ra[-an-tu-ud]
Dazima I bear for thee.

38. šeš-mu a-na-zu a-ra-gig til[-mu ma-gig]
My brother, what of thee is ill? My life is ill.

39. ^dnin-til im-ma-ra-an [-tu-ud]
Nintil I bear for thee.

40. šeš-mu a-na-zu a-ra-gig me-mu [ma-gig]
My brother, what of thee is ill? My reason is ill.

41. ^den-šág-mê im-ma-ra-an [-tu-ud]
Enšagmê I bear for thee.

42. tur-tur-lá-lá-ba tud-ne-en-ná-aš gar-ra-en [-na-áš]
These children, as they were born, they determined
(their destiny).

43. ^dab-ú lugal ú he-a
Let Abu be the king of vegetation.

44. ^dnin-tul-la en má-gán-na he-a
Let Nintulla be the lord of Magan.

²⁷ See Delitzsch, *Glossar*, p. 46.

²⁸ The reading *zi* may be assumed as it is a play upon the name *na-zi* in the following line.

45. ^dnin-ka-ù-tud ^dnin-a-zu ha-ba-an-tug-tug
Let Ninkautud marry Ninazu.

46. ^dnin-ka-si nig-šag-si he-a
Let Ninkasi be she who fills the heart.

47. ^dna-zi ù-mu-un-dar-a ha-ba-an-tug-tug
Let Nazi marry Umundara.

48. ^dda-zi-mă-a zi-im ha-ba-an-tug-tug
Let Dazima marry

49. ^dnin-[til] nin-iti-e he-a
Let Nintil be mistress of the month.

50. ^den-šág-mê en dilmun-na he-a
Let Enšagme be lord of Dilmun.

51. [^dNida]-ba zag-sal
Praise to Nidaba.³⁹

³⁹ Nidaba is the patron of scribes.

SOME NOTES ON THE SHEWA

By FRED T. KELLY, University of Wisconsin

IN his "Metrische Studien," Professor Sievers tells us that the "medial shewa" of the older grammars, with its "lightly closed" or "wavering" syllable, is but the invention of "schematisierende Grammatiker" (ingenious (?) or artful (?) grammarians), and that the syllable with a short vowel ending with what was formerly supposed to be a medial shewa, is, in reality, "closed."

In his later editions of Gesenius' Grammar, Professor Kautsch follows Professor Sievers by omitting the old classification of the medial shewa and half open syllable.

But let us see what ground the older grammarians had for their classification of "medial shewa" and "half open syllable."

If the names, as well as the idea, were not handed down by usage or tradition, they were probably postulated by the grammarians to account for certain phenomena present in the written language, relating, in the main, to the use of daghesh lene.

In the first place, they had observed that the so-called בְּנֵרְכֶּפֶת letters appeared with or without daghesh lene, i.e., the letter had a daghesh lene after a closed syllable, at the beginning of a sentence and after an open syllable with a relatively strong disjunctive accent, which is practically equivalent to saying that the hard sound of these letters is given when one begins to pronounce them after the organs of speech are allowed to close, either by pronouncing a consonant or by a pause. On the other hand, after an open syllable, except as indicated above, and after an initial shewa the daghesh lene was not used, that is, the letters are spirant after the organs of speech are allowed to open, even though it be merely to pronounce an initial shewa. Of course, when what would be a spirant is doubled, the letter has its hard sound, e.g., יְיַהּ, is pronounced yip-pol, not yiph-pol. Hence it was assumed that the absence of a daghesh lene meant that the preceding shewa was not silent, nor was it simply initial because the preceding vowel was short, and the syllable was called half open, or wavering. The same seemed to be

true for the syllable with an implied daghesh forte after a short vowel, as in the case of **מִקְרָפָת** cf. **מִקְרָרָת**.

This seemed to be confirmed, too, in the texts having a point in the non **בְּנִרְכָּפָת** letters, after what is really a closed syllable, e.g., the ordinary Niphal form is **נִעְבָּר** in פְּ "guttural verbs, but from the root חַמֵּר we have **חַמְפָּר**, another word of the same kind is **אַשְׁמָן**. The presence of the point seems to imply that the shewa might have been pronounced, and warning is given the reader that the shewa is silent.

Further, noting that the consecutive waw with the imperfect is pointed with a short vowel and followed by a daghesh forte in the preformative of the verb, or simply with a long vowel in compensation for the rejection of daghesh, in case of the preformative אַ, the grammarians, observing that when the vowel of the preformative volatilized, a following letter was spirant, concluded that there was good reason for calling the shewa medial and the syllable half open. Thus we have **יְבָא** and **יְבִיאָה** with the בְ spirant.

Apparently the guiding principle in the classification was whether or not the organs of speech were closed before pronouncing the representative in the word.

Professor Sievers starts out to show that there was no such category as "medial shewa," or "half open syllable," with two types of words: 1st, those containing a consonant which has a short vowel before it and has lost its own vowel, and, secondly, those having a consonant which has lost a daghesh forte as well as a vowel. Of the first class he gives **מִלְבֵּי** and **בִּנְפָּל** which he pronounces mal-che (our mal-khe) and bin-fol; of the second class he gives **קִשְׁאָו** and **יִקְרָחָה** which he pronounces kis'-o and yiq-chu. Later on, he adds **זִיכְרָוּן** with the suffixed form **זִיכְרָוֹנוּ**, pronouncing the latter zikh-ro-no (zikh-ro-no).

Since Professor Sievers appears simply to make an assertion about the first class without adducing any proof, it may be well to take the second class first.

It is true that we are justified in pronouncing **קִשְׁאָו** kis'-o, for we have the form **קִשְׁאָקְחָה** kis-'a-kha. Here Professor Sievers generalizes by saying that when a consonant loses its daghesh forte (as from **קִשְׁאָ**) and there is nothing left to support it but a shewa, that

shewa is quiescent, that is, that the vowel has disappeared as completely as the daghesh forte has. That is a fair statement of the fact as far as קִסְאֹה (kis-’o), is concerned, and it seems quite reasonable to say the same with regard to zikh-ro-no, from zik-ka-ron. Quite true, according to the test of the old school grammarians, the fact that the letter following the doubled (or “extended”) letter does not tell us whether the shewa might be vocal or not, yet, by common consent this has been assumed to be the pronunciation. Quite a number of words in Hebrew have this “zik-ka-ron” form. But only two were found with a בְּנֶרֶף letter after the doubled letter in the construct. These, in the suffixed and construct forms give עֲזָבָנִיּוֹת and עֲזָבָנִיּוֹת. The second has the same pointing for the doubled letter in the suffixed form, hence the shewa must be initial, but the first, according to the older grammarians, has a vocal shewa. Hence, while Professor Sievers may be right in his pronunciation zikh-ro-no, there is a case in that class of nouns that does not support it, as viewed from the old standpoint. And here, that is what we have to deal with. The two examples given above tend to show that when the Masoretes inserted the pointings the shewa under the radical that had been doubled was pronounced. The later pronunciation may be with the shewa silent as in the name of the Jewish Colony at Zemmarin — Zichron Ya’aqobh, but the only evidence we have points to at least a vocal shewa at that earlier time.

When the case of קִחָה is considered, Professor Sievers applies his statement with regard to the loss of daghesh and the vowel in the case of kis-’o. Thus far, no form of the verb exactly parallel has been found that will either substantiate or dispute his statement. His own example neither proves nor suggests anything, one way or the other. The difficulty is in finding a verb with a letter losing both daghesh and a full vowel and followed by a spirant. The nearest that can be suggested, perhaps, would be Piel perfects such as קָרְבָּנִי and שָׁרְחָנִי, and as a case somewhat analogous, the article with certain forms, as חַמְבָּקְשִׁים. All these might be explained as half open syllables because of the following spirants. Then the example given above of וַיַּבְאַחַת is suggestive along this line. To this we may add another example: We say that וַתְּבַרְךָ should be pronounced

wat-t^e-bha-rekh, but how, according to Professor Sievers's theory should we pronounce **וַיְבָרֶךְ**? Must we pronounce it way-bha-rekh as his theory seems to require?

We have suggestions along the same line from sources that do not show a spirant. For example, take the Piel form **הַלְּלָה** and its longer form **הַלְּלִיָּה** where tradition, at least, makes the shewa vocal with a short vowel before it. Frequently we find a compound shewa as in the Pual perfect **הַקְּרָה**. (This same "strengthening" to make the shewa more audible is found in other cases even with the daghesh forte retained as in **יִגְפְּנָה** from **גַּנְּנָה**. Perhaps the daghesh after the interrogative, such as **הַלְּבָנָה** may also be to insure pronunciation of the shewa. Likewise, possibly, the point in **עֲנָבִי** the construct plural of **עֲנָבָה**. Thus while the evidence for a medial shewa is not decisive, yet the lines of suggestion point in that direction.

Professor Sievers does not tell us how he reached the conclusion that the first syllable of **מִלְבָד** is closed by a quiescent shewa. If one were to conjecture with regard to the course of reasoning followed, he might surmise that he reasoned that if the **ם** in **כְּסָא** lost its vowel as well as its daghesh forte then in other cases a consonant may lose its vowel, and when the vowel preceding this is short the shewa is quiescent, and we have a closed syllable. In this particular case, the older grammarians might answer that as compared with the absolute plural **מִלְבָדִים** by removal of the tone, the short vowel was inserted to prevent the occurrence together of two vocal shewas.

All he says about the matter is that the syllable is closed, and that the pronunciation of the spirant has been retained, because this consonant originally had a vowel with it and required the spirant form of the letter, i.e., the "prehistoric" pronunciation of the **בְּנֶרֶף** letter is retained even after the vowel has disappeared entirely.

Apparently he applies the same principle in the case of **בְּנֶפֶל** but he says nothing whatever about the case of **לְנֶפֶל**. Would he call this a later development? Evidently it is an exception to his "prehistoric" theory, but hardly the "exception that proves the rule."

Since Professor Sievers offers no facts to support his statement with regard to this class of words, we have to take it as a mere supposition and treat it accordingly.

However we may present some characteristic forms illustrating the so-called "medial shewa" with its accompanying "half open" syllable: יְמָרִי from יְמָרָד and forms of that class; also the infinitive with suffixes: בְּתַבּוֹן and בְּתַבּוֹנָה; the interesting case of דְּבָרָכֶם from יְדָרָה; the Piel infinitive with a suffix בְּגַבְּכֶם; the Imperative with paragogic ה from קְרַבָּה and קְרַבָּה and also, apparently, the imperative הַלְּכָה.

Hence with the pointings as preserved to us, the older grammarians seem to have had some reason for assuming a species of syllable known as the "half open," and a shewa known as "medial." Nor does Professor Sievers present enough facts to disprove their theory, for, apart from the single undoubted case of פְּסָאָךְ and the possibility of some nouns of the class represented by זְבָרָן no other evidence is presented that may be called conclusive.

NOTE: Some say that פְּסָאָךְ is a foreign word, cf., the Aramaic and Syriac forms. If so, it would seem rather hazardous to base a whole system so largely on such changes as a foreign word shows.

A STUDY IN SUMERIAN CHRONOLOGY¹

By GEORGE TYLER MOLYNEUX, Chicago

HAMMURABI succeeded in uniting the petty kingdoms of the Tigris-Euphrates valley under his rule; but the construction of his empire is uncertain because of the fragmentary character of the documents which deal with the period. Many inscriptions of the kingdoms of Nisin and Larsa are extant; Nisin's dynastic date list has been known for some years, but the date and circumstances of the fall of that dynasty and its relation to the first Babylonian dynasty could only be conjectured until the recent discovery of the Larsa dynastic lists, and their publication by Clay² and Thureau-Dangin,³ supplemented by fragments reproduced in facsimile by Grice.⁴ These show that Nisin was conquered by Larsa under Rim-Sin and that Rim-Sin in turn was overthrown and succeeded by Hammurabi of Babylon.

Hammurabi succeeded Sin-Muballit in 2123 B.C. and ruled for forty-three years.⁵ He conquered Rim-Sin in his thirty-first⁶ and the latter's sixty-first regnal year,⁷ and ruled for twelve years and probably some months as the fifteenth king of Larsa succeeding Rim-Sin c.2092 B.C.⁸

Rim-Sin had conquered Nisin about the middle of his reign, as will appear later. That the Rim-Sin who overthrew Damiq-ilisu,

¹ The translations of the authors cited are used, but have been compared with the source material where published.

² Clay, A. T. *Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yale Babylonian Collection*. 1915. P. 30-31.

³ Thureau-Dangin, F. *La Chronologie des Dynasties de Sumer et d'Accad*. 1918. Pp. 4-10.

⁴ Grice, E. M. *Records from Ur and Larsa Dated in the Larsa Dynasty*. 1919. Pp. 17-19. Text No. 202, 207.

⁵ King, L. W. *History of Babylon*, *passim*. 1915.

⁶ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.* p. 31.

⁷ Clay, *op. cit.* p. 31.

⁸ For discussion, see Clay, *op. cit.* pp. 33-35. Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.* p. 3 reads the number fourteen years.

the last king of the Nisin dynasty and the Rim-Sin whom Hammurabi overthrew are identical is certain, though an allusion to a revolt led by one Rim-Sin in the tenth year of Hammurabi's successor, Samsuiluna,⁹ raises the question as to who this Rim-Sin could have been. Both the Rim-Sins first mentioned ruled over Larsa for sixty-one years,¹⁰ and the date formula for the Rim-Sin who conquered Nisin was written in the reign of Hammurabi,¹¹ which shows that the conquest of Nisin did not take place later in Samsu-iluna's reign. It is improbable, however, that the Rim-Sin of Samsu-iluna's reign is likewise to be identified with the Rim-Sin who conquered Nisin, because of the fact that that Rim-Sin succeeded his brother Warad-Sin,¹² who had reigned twelve years, coupled with the fact that if Rim-Sin had lived into the tenth year of Samsu-iluna, he would have been in public life the unparalleled period of eighty-three years. A Larsa insurgent would be very likely to adopt the name of the greatest of the Larsa kings, as Tiglath-Pileser IV of Assyria did in similar circumstances.

With a connection established between the fall of the Larsa dynasty and the Babylonian dynasty the next question is the relation between the fall of Nisin and these two dynasties. The date of the fall of Nisin and the fact that Nisin was finally overthrown by Larsa and not Babylon is revealed by the Thureau-Dangin Larsa date list, which dates the last thirty years of Rim-Sin's reign from his taking of "Nisin the royal city." As Hammurabi probably ruled twelve years and some months as the successor of Rim-Sin, about thirty-one years are left between his conquest of Larsa and his accession to the throne of Babylon. As Rim-Sin's date list shows a like number of years between his fall and his conquest of Nisin, the accession must have occurred about the same time, that is, about 2123 B.C.

This conquest of Nisin ended some sixteen years of warfare with neighboring states — Uruk, Nisin, Babylon, Sutum and Rapiqum,¹³ and had already ended in the taking of the cities of Ka-ida, Naz-

⁹ Clay, *op. cit.* pp. 37-39 for a discussion of this.

¹⁰ Cf. Clay and Thureau-Dangin lists.

¹¹ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.* p. 10.

¹² Grice, *op. cit.* p. 18.

¹³ Year 15. The insertion of "Babylon" is verified by fragments in Y. B. C., Grice, p. 20.

rum,¹⁴ Imgur-Gibil, Zibnatum,¹⁵ Bit-Gimil-Sin, Uzarpara,¹⁶ Kisurra, Durum,¹⁷ Uruk, "city of Damiq-ilišu,"¹⁸ and "Dunnum the principal city of Nisin."¹⁹ Thureau-Dangin, by translating the date formula for the twenty-sixth year "[Année où, avec la force sublime d'Anu, Ellil et Enki, le pasteur légitime [Ri]m-Sin prit la "ville de Damiq-ilišu," la foule (des habitants) . . . d'Isin, transféra à Larsa . . . établit pour toujours sa puissance victorieuse," assumes that this refers to the capture of the royal city. In supplying to the translation of the phrase

"[mu á-m]ah An^d En-lil ^dEn-ki-ga-ta
 uru^{ki} Dam-ki-i-lí-šu á-dam zag-šu-dib-bi I-si-in^{ki}-ka
 sib-zi(d) ^d[Ri-i]m^d-Sin in-dib-ba
 . . . -ra lù . . . Arar^{ki}-ma-šú bí-in-tù(r)-ri
 [u] (d)-ul-a-ta ù-ma-a-ni mu-un-gub-ba,"

the definite article, he adds undue emphasis. Since there is no article in Sumerian, it is as correct to translate the phrase "*a city of Damiq-ilišu*," which would merely indicate that Rim-Sin broke off a fragment from the Nisin realms. The significance of the event is in showing that Rim-Sin and Damiq-ilišu, the last king of Nisin were contemporary or nearly so, as otherwise the city would probably not have been referred to as Damiq-ilišu's city.²⁰ The fact that Rim-Sin took "Dunnum the principal city of Nisin" in his thirtieth year and that he began dating from the fall of Nisin the next year when "avec l'armé sublime d'Anu, Ellil et Enki, Isin, la ville royale, avec la foule de ses (habitants), autant qu'il y en avait, le pasteur légitime Rim-Sin la prit, fit grâce de la vie à sa nombreuse population et illustra pour l'éternité le nom de sa (propre) royauté," marks the real overthrow of the Nisin dynasty, otherwise he would not have waited until that time to date from this victory, a victory so great that it was the last significant date before his own overthrow thirty years later.

The date formula for the seventeenth year of Sin-Muballit "Mu I-si-in [In-Dib-Ba]," "The year [in which the city of] Nisin [was

¹⁴ Year 16.

¹⁵ Year 19.

¹⁶ Year 26.

¹⁵ Year 18.

¹⁷ Year 21.

¹⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.* p. 45.

²⁰ The Assyrian reference to Israel as the "land of Omri" is not a parallel, as Israel was far from Assyria, while these kingdoms were in constant intercourse.

taken],"²¹ is to be compared with the date formulae for the twenty-sixth and thirtieth years of Rim-Sin, and instead of referring to the final overthrow of Nisin is probably merely a record of one of the weaker neighboring kingdoms encroaching on the territory of the rapidly declining Nisin dynasty.

²¹ King, L. W. *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, King of Babylon, 1898-1900.* Vol. 3, pp. 228-229 and note 39.

REVIEWS

Sumerian Liturgies and Psalms. By Stephen Langdon. Publications of the Babylonian section, Vol. X, No. 4. Published by the University Museum, Philadelphia, 1919, pp. 233-351, Pls. LXXI-CV.

In this volume from the industrious pen of the new Professor of Assyriology at Oxford University we have a series of most interesting and important religious poems from the Nippur collection. In his introduction Dr. Langdon gives a résumé of the religious material in the collection, emphasizing the epical or *zag-sal* group and differentiating between the *zag-sal* on the one hand and hymns and psalms on the other. The Sumerians applied the term *zag-sal* to didactic and theological compositions, treatises concerning the deeds and characters of the great gods. He then describes the rich liturgical materials, and refers to his own reconstruction of an Enlil liturgy in this volume, in order that the reader may obtain an idea of the elaborate liturgical worship of the late Sumerian period. These liturgies were adopted by the Babylonians and Assyrians as canonical and were employed in interlinear editions. The *kišub* or precanonical liturgies are in a better state of preservation and in them the Nippur collection is rich. A good example of a composite *kišub* is given on pages 290-292 of this work. It contains eleven *kišubs* or prayers, which are cast in such a manner as to set forth one idea which progresses from the beginning to the end. An important breviary is given on pages 279-285, belonging to the cult of the moon-god, in which each song has an antiphon. The author notes what seems to be almost inexplicable, namely, the absence of prayers of private devotion in the Nippur collection. Finally, in the Introduction, the author refers to the existence of songs to supposedly deified kings.

The selection of poetical material which Professor Langdon has given to the public in this volume is rich and of the highest importance. The first is a "Lamentation of Ishme-Dagan over Nippur." Of the same kind are a "Lamentation on the Pillage of Lagash by the Elamites," a "Lamentation to Innini on the Sorrows of Erech,"

and a "Lamentation on the Destruction of Ur." The volume is rich in liturgical materials, among them being a "Liturgy of the Cult of Ishme-Dagan," liturgical hymns to Innini and Sin, a "Liturgy to Enlil," and a "Liturgy of the Cult of Kesh." The last tablet translated and discussed is Ni. 6060, a Cassite tablet in four columns, with valuable information concerning Babylonian mystic symbols. The reverse of this tablet contains a lexicographical commentary of considerable value on mythological phrases.

The difficulty in making pioneer translations of Sumerian unilingual texts is well known, and no one succeeds as well as Professor Langdon. But the author does not stop at transliteration and translation, he furnishes his renderings with copious introductions and critical notes which are full of original observations and reliable information for the student of ancient religions. The translations included in this volume are very reliable. Here and there a slight inconsistency occurs, such as line 26 on page 294 and line 36 on page 297, or a slip such as the omission of the translation of *men* in line 9 on page 289, but they are inconsequential in comparison with the richness and fulness of material, often most original, which this expert Sumerologist almost always presents.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

Historical, Religious and Economic Texts and Antiquities. By James B. Nies and Clarence E. Keiser. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920, pp. 78, Pls. LXXVI.

This is volume two of a series in which the Babylonian inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies are being published. Like volume one, it has been sumptuously published by the Yale University Press, which is at present doing so much for Oriental learning. The publishers and printers are to be congratulated upon their splendid work. It should be noted that the volume is dedicated to Mrs. Nies, who, shortly before her death, gave the magnificent sum of \$50,000.00 to the cause of Oriental research.

In this volume 136 texts have been autographed, out of which 26 have been transliterated and translated. The autographs were made by Dr. Keiser, as were also the full indices and contents. Dr. Keiser also transliterated, translated, and discussed nine of the texts, the balance of the 26 having been done by Dr. Nies.

The material embraced in this volume ranges from the fourth to the latter part of the first millennium B.C. The texts hail from Babylon, Sippar, Larsa, Lagash, and Erech. They are written in Sumerian and Babylonian. There is one bilingual, and one fragment of a syllabary. The material will be found valuable by students of all phases of Sumerian and Babylonian civilization. The first text to be discussed is an important Net-Cylinder of Entemena which, with the exception of three variants, is a duplicate of the famous cone published by Thureau-Dangin in 1898. But perhaps the most important text is a bilingual incantation, discussed by Dr. Keiser. Its importance lies in the fact that several new Semitic values for Sumerian words are found. They are: *šaqū* for *sukud*, *kupū* for *a-gi*, *ur-ru-ub* for *ud-šu-uš-šub*, *puzru* for *á-úr*, *hamatu* for *sud*, *kalamu* for *pád*, *aš-ri-iš* for *ki-in-gi*, *nid-bu* for *nig-ninni*, *ašapu* for *ag*, and perhaps *lapatu* for *dug*. The fragment of a syllabary would be of more importance if it were larger. It is worthy of note that No. 8, page 16, gives us the full name of the temple of Ningirsu in Lagash, namely, *Lugalennu*; and that in No. 15, page 20, Kurigalzu is called the *good* king. Dr. Keiser's argument, on page 41, "that the Sumerians deified their kings and rulers is clear from the published texts, where *their names are written with the determinative for god*," may just as logically be used to prove the deification of an incantation (page 19). The deification of Babylonian kings may in time be demonstrated, but the presence of the divine determinative is decidedly not conclusive.

A translation of the economic texts is promised for a future publication. This will be awaited with much interest.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

Ethiopic Grammar, with Chrestomathy and Glossary. By Samuel A. B. Mercer. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. Pp. 116. \$1.50.

The appearance of Dr. Mercer's Ethiopic Grammar is an exceedingly welcome event to students of Semitics. It is not creditable to English and American scholarship that we have had so long to depend upon works in French and German, or upon Crichton's translation of Bezold's Dillmann.

The Ethiopic language, which some prefer to call Ge'ez, (to avoid confusion through the use of the term 'Ethiopian,' with hamitic

tongues such as Galla), though no longer a spoken language, is of great value to students of comparative philology. It is a Semitic language, carried by emigrants from the extreme south of Arabia, possibly a thousand years B.C., into the kingdom of Axum, the modern Abyssinia. The script shows signs of conscious development and, unlike other Semitic scripts, employs a syllabary rather than an alphabet. Also, while the early Sabaean inscriptions were written from right to left, or occasionally 'plough-wise,' the 'tongue of the free' is written from left to right.

There are many reasons for a renewed study of Ethiopic such as the publication of Dr. Mercer's book should stimulate. First, there is the connection of the language with the old Himyaritic or Sabaean. Secondly, there is the quite considerable mass of liturgical and other ecclesiastical literature in Ethiopic preserved by the Abyssinian Church, not to speak of other literature translated originally from the Greek and the Arabic. Thirdly, there is the interest which the subject must have for the comparative study of the Semitic group of languages.

Dr. Mercer has already laid us under obligation through his liturgical renderings. Now he has increased the debt by giving us this very concise and well-arranged grammar. Most grammars for beginners are far too long and too technical, and the present author has acted wisely in confining himself to the necessary elements of the language, while pointing out the sections which it is essential that the student should memorize. The addition of the admirable exercises, Chrestomathy and glossary will be very highly appreciated by teacher and scholar alike. The script will, of course, offer considerable difficulty from the outset, but Dr. Mercer, through his very sparing use of transliteration, has rightly insisted on this difficulty being surmounted at the very start.

All the striking features of Ge'ez, such as the absence of the article, the number of primitive verbal forms, and the like, are clearly and intelligibly presented.

A word of praise is due, though perhaps under the circumstances needless, for the excellent manner in which the book is printed by the Clarendon Press.

HERBERT H. GOWEN.

The Orient in Bible Times. By Elihu Grant. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1920. Pp. 336. \$2.50 net.

Modern students of the Old Testament are more fortunate than their forefathers. Formerly the Bible was studied as if the Hebrew people occupied, in political and military importance, the centre of the Oriental stage. All this has been changed, and Professor Grant testifies in a simple way to what may be considered now an established fact, namely, that Palestine was but a small buffer state between the great world-empires of ancient days. With this as a certainty, and after reminding his readers of our modern interest in ancient Oriental civilizations, the author reviews our knowledge of the countries surrounding Palestine and takes up a more detailed study of the great centres of ancient culture. Egypt and her relations with Asia, Sumeria, Babylonia, and Assyria are all described and their individual contributions to civilization, and influence upon Palestine are recounted. Then follows a survey of the nearer and smaller neighbours, and finally, Palestine itself and its people come under closer survey, leading up to discussion of the background of New Testament times.

There is nothing original in this book nor even very fresh, except such unusual transliterations as "Beeroth," Dayr el-Bahri, Shumer, (Enmaus is a printer's error) but the work is well worth reading and deserves an extensive circulation.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

Lunar and Solar Messianic Almanac. By Edward Samuel Niles. Privately published, 1920. Pp. 108.

This little pamphlet has for its object the demonstration of "the harmony in creation with the Bible records concerning the Messiah and his dispensations." Many interesting facts are here reproduced. But fact and tradition or supposition are not always clearly differentiated, and Semitic and other Oriental terms are uncritically used. The reviewer is bound to say that the author's conclusions do not seem to him to follow what the facts certainly warrant. However, the book is most unusual and highly interesting. The comparative tables of the Lunar and Solar Almanac deserve special attention.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

The Prophets in the Light of To-day. By John Godfrey Hill. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1919. Pp. 240. \$1.25 net.

The author's purpose in this excellent little book is "to attract busy people to the grandeur of the Hebrew Prophets . . . to help correct, without needless offense, prevalent unscholarly misuse of prophecy." The work is in no sense technical or original. But it is a successful attempt to understand the Hebrew prophets and to make them speak to the modern heart. After a few introductory chapters on the nature and interpretation of prophecy, the author takes up the subject of the prophets and their personality, their writings, their ideas, their religion, their politics, their predictions, and their permanence. All these ideas he treats in a fresh and vivid manner. Certain defects are to be noted, such as, his sweeping statement about the *negative* character of Egyptian morals (p. 158), and his one-sided estimate of the priestly character of Old Testament religion (pp. 172 ff.), but the work is on the whole highly commendable, and decidedly worth while. In a future edition Zachariah, page 210, should read Zechariah.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

Les Psaumes, extrait de la Bible du Centenaire, traduction nouvelle d'après les meilleurs textes avec introduction et notes, Paris, Société Biblique de Paris, 1920. Pp. iv + 188.

This edition of the Psalms is reprinted from the *Bible du Centenaire*, a monumental translation of the Scriptures edited by A. Lods, M. Goguel and other French and Swiss scholars. We know of no better translation of the Psalms in any language. It is based on a critical text, built on a comparative study of the masoretic text and the versions, without dogmatic presuppositions. It has avoided the pitfall of metrical theories which has spoiled so much of the work of Briggs in the *International Critical Commentary*. Words or passages that are corrupt are left untranslated in the body of the text. The translation has besides great literary value. The poetical form is clearly set forth. The critical and exegetical notes are full without being too bulky. The living message of the Psalter, we were going to say, the true word of God, at the danger of being called unscientific by some, has never been better presented. If only this translation could find its way into the hands of our Prayer Book

revisers and of the members of our Convention, there would be probably less danger of our hallowing sixteenth-century errors.

JOHN A. MAYNARD.

Études Syriennes. By Franz Cumont. Paris: Auguste Picard, 1917. Pp. 379. 18 Frs.

This volume contains the archaeological and geographical fruit of a trip made in North Syria in the spring of 1907, together with many valuable observations and discussions by the eminent Orientalist, Franz Cumont. Four of the chapters have been, wholly or in part, published before, but it is a decided advantage to have them now in this easily accessible form. Chapters one, three, four, six and seven are archaeological and geographic, almost entirely. Chapter two is an interesting discussion of "l'aigle funéraire d'Hiérapolis et l'apothéose des empereurs," in which the author shows reasons for believing that the funerary eagle, so common on Oriental monuments, was sacred to the Sun, and was the messenger that reported the coming of souls liberated from earthly bodies, and that transported them (especially royal souls) to the stars. In discussing the origin of the eagle, he reviews much pertinent Babylonian, Egyptian and Hittite material, and thinks that the eagle had its home at a very early period among the Hittites in North Syria, where it represented simply the soul of the dead. Chapter five is another interesting study. It is a discussion of "Dolichè et le Zeus Dolichènos," in which Cumont concludes that Zeus Dolichènos was originally a sky-god, whom the peoples of North Syria worshipped on the mountain tops. In chapter eight he studies "le culte de l'Euphrate," tracing the idea back to Assyrian and Babylonian times; "sacrifice au dieu Bèl," which he shows to have had a long history, continuing down into Roman times; and "le double Fortune des Sémites et les processions à dos de chameau," which he thinks may have been related to astrological ideas, and in which he sees in a twin statue of Tyche upon the camel, a beast which in time came to be associated peculiarly with religious processions.

The book closes with a full detailed archaeological and geographical itinerary from Aleppo to Beroea and back to Alexandretta, a reproduction and discussion of the inscriptions (Greek) which were

found on the trip, a list of manuscripts acquired, and a complete geographical and general index. The work is a mine of useful material and original observations.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

Herrn D. W. Myhrman's Ausgabe des Kitāb Mu'īd an-ni'am wa-Mubid an-Niqiam. Von K. V. Zetterstéen. Uppsala and Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1913. Pp. 64.

This pamphlet contains one of the most penetrating criticisms and scathing condemnations of a modern publication known to the reviewer. It should serve as a warning to any student who contemplates the publication of an Oriental manuscript, to do the work faithfully or not at all. The present reviewer knows by personal use of Dr. Myhrman's edition of the *Subkī* that Zetterstéen has not been a bit too severe.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

History of Religions. II Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism. By George Foot Moore. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919. Pp. 552. \$3.00.

This is the second volume of Professor Moore's *History of Religions*. In this volume are discussed the three religions whose fundamental idea is revelation, and which have the doctrine of creation by divine fiat and the doctrine of the catastrophic end of the world in common. All three are soteric religions, and each asserts that it is the only way. It has been appropriate to treat these great religions together because of their far-reaching resemblances, although each has an individuality all its own, especially Christianity, whose dogma of salvation through the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ has no counterpart in Judaism or Mohammedanism. Professor Moore, in studying these allied though different religions has done more than record facts and trace ideas and institutions. He has sought to represent each religion as an understanding adherent of each would do. He begins with Judaism, the oldest, which he handles in a masterful manner. After tracing the development of the religion of ancient Israel from the earliest times, he takes up the religion of the prophets. Here he seems to fall into

the common error of many modern students of prophetic religion, namely, in asserting that the prophets did not give themselves the least concern about ritual and ceremonial. It is very true that the prophets emphasized the moral and spiritual aspects of religion, but a religion without ceremonial was unknown to the ancient world. His third chapter on Judaism treats of that important period from the time of Alexander to the formulation of the Talmud. Here Professor Moore has made excellent use of that vast body of extra-canonical Jewish literature which he so well understands. It is disappointing, however, that he did not go more fully into the question of the synagogue and its influence on the daily religious life of the people. The last chapter on Judaism takes us down to our own times. This period necessarily had to be very generally stated, there being only a little over twenty pages devoted to it.

In 278 pages Dr. Moore succeeds wonderfully well in telling the story of Christianity, its origin and its progress. Lack of proportion in the treatment of certain subjects is inevitable, most conspicuous is the short space given our Lord's life and teaching and the English Reformation. For the brevity on the former the conservative scholar will doubtless be grateful, for it is the most radical and the least satisfying portion of the work. One wonders why Josephus' account of St. John Baptist's imprisonment and death should have been preferred to that given in the Gospel (p. 108). The story of our Lord's life is purely humanitarian. He was the son of Joseph and Mary, He had four brothers and sisters also; there is much excuse for His enemies, and the character of His teaching is rather belittled: "However different the emphasis of his teaching from that of the school and the synagogue, he had on doctrine about God's nature and character, or about what he requires of men, or on his relation to his people and his purpose for them, or concerning the hereafter of the individual and the world, that would have been unfamiliar to a well-instructed Jew of his time" (p. 114). Christ is a divine being, but "of inferior order, subordinate to the Father" (p. 126); this is to use "divine" in a sense only possible to a Gnostic or an Arian. The presentation of Pauline theology is much more satisfying, there is an excellent description of the Pauline conception of faith and of the nature of the sacraments, the latter was not borrowed from the mystery religions. Justin's description "contains

substantially the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist" (p. 151), which leads us to desire a definition of the author's use of "Catholic." The antipathy of the Ep. of Barnabas to the Jewish religion and the Old Testament is so stated as to make Barnabas a Marcionite. There is a good treatment of the Gnostics and of the Alexandrian School, full justice being done to the Christology of Origen; but there is less emphasis upon the service the West rendered in the development of Trinitarian and Christological expression, as, e.g., Tertullian's replacement of *Ἄργος* by the more personal *vībūs*, which became the Nicene term. "The Son is in all respects unlike the distinctive nature (*οὐσία*) of the Father" (p. 179) states the logical outcome of Arianism rather than the teaching of Arius himself. The note (p. 180) — "The so-called Nicene Creed as it is used in modern liturgies is not the creed adopted at Nicaea or by any other council" — is wholly misleading. There is a disappointing silence as to the development of the doctrines of the Church and ministry, but the Catholic conceptions are said (p. 231) to have their origins in the Apostolic or sub-Apostolic Age.

Errors in fact are surprisingly few; an instance may be found on p. 234 where it is said that the Church of England has sought to convert the modern Nestorians, but questionable dogmatic interpretations are more common, as the assertion (p. 185) that the solution of the Arian controversy was found in the homoian interpretation of the Creed, the attribution to St. John of Damascus of the physical-transformation doctrine of the Eucharist which became Greek orthodoxy (p. 239), and the cause assigned, monastic use in Ireland, for the increasing resort to the sacrament of penance. Certain liturgical errors are to be found also; p. 218 makes the Roman use of the fourth and fifth centuries more complicated and elaborate than elsewhere, and the statement (p. 321) that Luther in his revision of the Mass omitted the Canon. More serious is the assertion (p. 312) that the Articles of Edward VI "flatly denied the real presence."

The tone of the work is refreshingly non-partisan; there is conspicuous fairness in the treatment of the Roman Church; one finds no allusion to the Pornocracy or to the Forged Decretals; the Tridentine decree on justification is "more consistently scriptural than Luther" (p. 346), the "Annals" of Baronius is a "work of

enormous erudition and genuine historical spirit" (p. 350), in contrast to that of the Magdeburg Centuriators; credit is given the Church of Rome for missionary activity, though one misses an allusion to the work of the C. M. S. when it is said that missionary interest is not found apart from the Roman Church prior to the nineteenth century. The Reformation is treated at considerable length, its failure to introduce a new and higher spiritual and moral tone acknowledged and the consequent appearance of the *ecclesiolae in ecclesia*. Lutherans will probably object to the treatment of Luther, e.g., "he had comparatively little interest in theology and was not much troubled by logical consistency" (p. 336). But the general verdict will agree that Dr. Moore has succeeded uniquely, apart from his treatment of its Founder, in giving Christianity its place in the History of Religions.

A brief, but generally well-chosen, bibliography is given (pp. 526-529), in which there is rather an excessive predominance of German works, and the inclusion of a few, as Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, seemingly out of place in so short a list; one might question the recommendation of Loof's "Leitfaden" as the most useful work for the student of the history of dogma; the excellent works of Tixeront and Otten in this field are not mentioned; Battifol's "Primitive Catholicism" is also missing, and there are no books on liturgical history.

The first chapter on Mohammedanism is devoted to a well arranged study of the prophet himself. The sources of Mohammed's life are used with critical discrimination and a good deal of sympathetic insight, although one is often made to feel that Professor Moore was not altogether successful in putting himself in the place of a Mohammedan and thinking and feeling as he thinks and feels. The next chapter, on the doctrinal controversies of the Caliphate, shows how difficult it is for reason to be allowed free rein in a religion of authority. The third chapter is on the partisans of Ali, where the principle of legitimacy is shown to have assumed a religious as well as a political aspect. This was the attitude assumed by the partisans and followers of Ali. After a good chapter on mysticism and philosophy, the author takes al-Ghazali as the man who gave to Mohammedan theology and ethics the form which in all essentials it has retained ever since, and gives us a clear presentation of the theology

of the Moslem Thomas Aquinas. Then follows a chapter on creed, worship, and morals, and finally an interesting account of the extravagant sects of Mohammedanism and of the derivative religions. A good list of selected literature and a useful index bring this valuable work to a close.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER,
FRANK H. HALLOCK.

